



1190836

**Re: Gladstone**

**Sabrina Forrest** to: David Reisman

06/07/2007 12:01 PM

From: Sabrina Forrest/EPR/R8/USEPA/US

To: David Reisman/CI/USEPA/US

Cc: Jan\_Christner@URSCorp.com, Jerry\_Goedert@URSCorp.com

---

Thanks for the thorough response to all of us. Please see below for my responses.

Sabrina Forrest

Site Assessment Manager

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1595 Wynkoop Street, Mail Code: 8EPR-B

Denver, CO 80202-1129

Direct Ph: 303-312-6484

Toll Free: 1 800-227-8917, 312-6484

E-mail: forrest.sabrina@epa.gov

David Reisman/CI/USEPA/US

**David Reisman/CI/USEPA/US**

06/07/2007 07:44 AM

To Jan\_Christner@URSCorp.com,  
Jerry\_Goedert@URSCorp.com, Sabrina  
Forrest/EPR/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

cc

Subject Re: Gladstone

Jan / Jerry / Sabrina,

Jan, of course that I remember our talk. It appears very little slips by Jerry and you. I also just got a call from Jean M. who spoke with Jerry about Philadelphia mine. I need to return her call. I think that URS has become our Center's marketing arm, and I do appreciate all the communication and recommendations.

To address your issue, Karl Ford (BLM) and I have been discussing several sites for the past year. We have a draft MOU being reviewed by EPA, BLM and USFS management on collaboration on mine-influenced water (MIW) technology development and technical consultation. The 3 agencies are often working on the same site, and hopefully the MOU will assist the field personnel by having some assistance on their sites. Ed Bates works out of our Center, and was in the car in Idaho when Karl discussed Evelyn. He volunteered himself to see the site and offer suggestions. While I tried to discourage that visit until the MOU was in place, Ed informed me last week that he had been discussing the site with BLM. I had told Ed that we could visit all these sites in July, but he has his schedule, and Ed does what Ed wants. I agree that it makes sense to consolidate efforts, and I tried to convince Ed of this issue.

I discussed the issue with Karl yesterday morning, and have been assured that BLM's plans are just to visit that and one other site and get suggestions. I told him that the Gladstone area was the priority for the region, and he understood. He was apologetic for the misunderstanding, and hopefully the MOU will prevent these issues in the future with better communication. I think our Center was equally responsible, but we had discussed this site with Karl prior to our discussion, and my talks with Jerry and Sabrina. Our main client on

any of these sites is the region and the region's priorities. Any other work to agencies such as BLM will not affect our work with the region, and if it does, we will stop any counter-productive assistance.

As for the material that Jerry sent and the Ionic Water Tech. proposal, I have made it through about half the report and through the proposal (I am off this week and reading in the am and late night after home jobs are done). I see some possibilities, and I agree with Jerry's questions, plus I will have some of my own. For ORD to participate, there will also have to be a QAPP developed. ***(Sabrina Q: Who would be responsible for QAPP development?)***

Sabrina, I am going to be in your building on June 20. I have a site visit near Boulder on the 19 th, another meeting and conference call on the 20 th. Will you be in the office and could we meet to discuss this site? I should be through all the material by that time. Let me know as I am arranging my schedule for I will be out of the country next week. ***(Sabrina Resp: I have a local conference and can make myself available from 12:15 -1:30, or from 3:30 - 5:00. Do either of those times work?)***

I have 2 large questions that will start my thoughts:

-I realize that this is in CERCLIS for the watershed. ***(Sabrina Resp: The site has been in CERCLIS since about 1994, but there has always been an informal deferral-like understanding to keep NPL listing out of the watershed and allow the stakeholder process to undertake activities at prioritized mine sites that would improve water quality at a TMDL compliance point below the confluence of the Animas River and Mineral Creek. Cement Creek flows into the Animas.)*** I am also under the impression that a Brownfield grant was issued. ***(Sabrina Resp: There is EPA Targeted Brownfields Assessment technical support by UOS for the Gladstone area, was TBA support for the Martha Rose/Walsh Smelter site. The second TBA was used by the County successfully to compete for a Brownfields Cleanup Grant; goal being to get affordable housing built. That site is at the south edge of town, near the mouth of Mineral Creek.)*** What is the current SF classification, and is there a ROD? ***(Sabrina Resp: There are several CERCLIS IDs associated with the area, but the applicable one is the Upper Animas Mining District. It is Active, and the last action after the Expanded Site Inspection, was Recommended for HRS Scoring, although we have not seriously considered listing here. We also are beginning to have our removal group (OSC - Steve Way) getting involved with BLM non-time critical removal actions where there is mixed-ownership. Who are all the parties at the table right now? (Sabrina Resp: Many parties are involved in the overall Animas River Stakeholders Group; They are ad hoc and prefer all parties to be present and to gain consensus before critical decisions are made. Regarding Gladstone, almost all the appropriate parties are involved, a few are PRPs; ARSG, BLM, Gold King Corp., Salem Minerals Corp(Todd Hennis), Sunnyside Mining (Newmont/ KinRoss/EchoBay), and EPA, but there are a few private landowners who will need to be contacted depending on what happens where.) Who is the lead Agency? (Sabrina Resp: There really is not an "agency" lead in Gladstone. We don't have any enforceable actions in place in Gladstone, EPA is a member and supporter of the ARSG. It is complicated due to some ownership issues, one being that Salem Minerals is suing Sunnyside for his belief that they were released from their Water related consent decree too soon and that they should still be responsible for addressing water treatment and water quality-related issues in the watershed. That being said, if there needs to be some sort of remedial or removal-type action to get work accomplished, there would need to be significant salesmanship done on the ARSG Coordinator (Bill Simon) for EPA to be lead on anything - There has always been a certain disdain for Superfund program involvement.)***

-This is a lot of contaminated water both from man-made and natural issues. What is the goal of any remediation, is it reduced load going into Cement Creek and the Animas River? ***(Sabrina Resp: The goal is to reduce metals, primarily copper and zinc, as much as possible so that standards can be met at compliance point A72 on the Animas. Cement is "cemented," never has been nor will be a fishery, has always had ambient standards to meet, but there is the need to remove metals to have a lasting impact on downstream water quality, and the fisheries there. These loaders in upper Cement Creek, if treated, would help tremendously. Surely you want aquatic life to return in Cement Creek, if it was there***

prior to mining, but the chances of that may be slim.

I would like to schedule a visit to the site and then go down to Standard Mine on the same trip. Please also let me know the time frame of your next scheduled visit to the site. *(Sabrina Resp: I was hoping to go down this June 21st for the stakeholder meeting, but due to our national site assessment symposium and my being involved with a panel, I can't go. Jerry Goedert can't make it either, and I don't know if Jan can make it. I also don't know if we have any news to share with them about the Ionic group or your possible involvement, if we do, then I think there should be some presence. I would say then that the next trip for me would be for the July 19th monthly meeting. Can you make it back for that?)*

Thanks  
dave

David J. Reisman, Director  
ORD Engineering Technical Support Center MLK-489  
National Risk Management Research Laboratory  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45268  
513-487-2588 FAX 513-487-2533  
EPA Cell Phone: 513-919-7136  
Jan\_Christner@URSCorp.com

Jan\_Christner@URSCorp.com

06/06/2007 01:43 PM

To David Reisman/CI/USEPA/US@EPA

cc Jerry\_Goedert@URSCorp.com, Sabrina  
Forrest/EPR/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject Gladstone

I don't know if you'd remember, but I talked with you after one of the Standard Mine SRB conference calls about the Gladstone project near Silverton, Colorado and a proposal from Tim Tsukamoto. I hear Sabrina Forrest contacted you regarding the Gladstone project and you are considering the possibilities. Jerry Goedert recently heard that the BLM (Karl Ford) has contacted Ed Bates regarding an adit discharge (from the Evelyn mine) near Gladstone that also discharges into Cement Creek. During 2005 that site discharged a relatively small amount of water compared to the adits we have identified as higher priorities for treatment. Just thought you'd want to know in case it makes sense to consolidate efforts.

This e-mail and any attachments are confidential. If you receive this message in error or are not the intended recipient, you should not retain, distribute, disclose or use any of this information and you should destroy the e-mail and any attachments or copies.